

REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 18, 2006, claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 11-14, 21-22, 25, and 32-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.: 6,467,890 to Tajima et al. ("Tajima"). Claims 21, 32, 37, 39-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.: 6,796,643 to Higuma et al. ("Higuma"). Claim 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,164,766 to Erickson ("Erickson"). Further, claims 6-9 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,247,807 to Yang et al. ("Yang"). Additionally, claims 15, 17-18, 20 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,619,766 to Yoshiyama et al. ("Yoshiyama"). Lastly, claims 10, 16, 19, 23, 24, 28 and 31 stand objected to as being dependent on an rejected claim but otherwise allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of the above, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 16, 19, 21, 23, 28, and 31, when considered with the remarks below are deemed to place the application in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the upper portions of the multiple rooms are located opposite and distal from the inkjet head in the direction substantially perpendicular to the reciprocating direction of the carriage. Stated otherwise, referring to Fig. 1, the upper portions of the multiple rooms are located proximal to the top of movable tanks 30 because they are opposite and distal from inkjet head 5 in the vertical direction. Additional support for the location of the upper portions can be found in Fig. 3A, which shows wall 36 not extending the entire height of body 35 allowing for fluid communication between first ink room 41 and second ink room 42. *See* specification at page 17, paragraph [0063]. No new matter is being added by

this amendment. Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Claims 10, 16, 19, 23, 28 and 31 have been amended into independent form since they were only objected to. Claims 1-42 remain pending in the application.


Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-18, 20-22, 25-27, 29-30, and 32-41 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by either Tajima or Higuma alone or in combination with the above-cited secondary references. Independent claim 1 clearly specifies that the upper portion of the multiple rooms in the movable tank is proximal to the top of the tank, which is opposite and distal from the inkjet head in the vertical direction (i.e., the direction perpendicular to the reciprocating direction of the carriage). Both Tajima and Higuma disclose that fluid communication between the compartments of the inkjet tank occur at the bottom portion of the tanks, which is proximal to the inkjet head in the vertical direction. For example, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Fig. 2A of Tajima which shows ink communication portion 206 located at the bottom. *See also* Tajima at column 8, lines 29-54. Likewise, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Fig. 11A of Higuma, which shows clearance 8 located between partition wall 5 and flat bottom member 11. *See also* Higuma at column 11, lines 11-26. Neither Tajima nor Higuma teach or suggest any means of providing fluid communication at the top of their respective ink tanks. In addition, none of the secondary references alter the teachings of Tajima or Higuma. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants also respectfully submit that claim 42 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Higuma alone or in combination with the above-cited secondary references. Higuma discloses in Fig. 11B nozzles 73 being arranged in a left-to-right orientation. Based on this orientation, one skilled in the art would expect the movement of the carriage holding cartridge 1

to be also in the left-to right direction relative to the cross-sectional view shown in Fig. 11A. As a result, partition wall 5 of cartridge 1 is arranged in a direction perpendicular to the movement of the carriage. To the contrary, claim 42 requires the dividing member to be arranged in the movable direction of carriage. Nothing in the secondary references teach or suggest altering the orientation of the partition wall in Fig 11A of Higuma. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

A request for a three month extension of time and fees are also enclosed. Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are due. However, if any additional fees are due, please charge such sums to our Deposit Account 50-1145.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald Levy
Reg. No. 24,419

Lindsay S. Adams
Reg. No. 36,425

Attorneys for Applicants

Pitney Hardin LLP
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036-7311
(212) 297-5800